

Serial No. 09/766,835
Amendment Dated: November 29, 2004
Reply to Office Action Mailed July 28, 2004
Attorney Docket No. 622/43633C3

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesy of the personal interview with the undersigned as accurately reflected in the Interview Summary prepared by the Examiner.

As pointed out during the interview, the Lee patent is not an effective reference because its U.S. filing date is March 30, 1999 and Applicants' effective filing date is October 22, 1997. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 83-99 and 102 as being anticipated by Lee under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of Claims 64-81 and 101 as being unpatentable over Sundar in view of Lee under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

The rejections of Claims 46-55, 59-62 and 100 as being anticipated by Sundar under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and of Claims 56-58 as being unpatentable over Sundar in view of Edwards et al under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the proposed amendment to Claim 100 and the following comments which summarize the discussion at the interview.

The Sundar apparatus uses processing stations configured as tandem processing chambers which operate on equal batches of two workpieces. This configuration does not teach or even suggest a device whose method to manufacture workpieces in which a batch processed at one station is different

Serial No. 09/766,835

Amendment Dated: November 29, 2004
Reply to Office Action Mailed July 28, 2004
Attorney Docket No. 622/43633C3

from the batch at another station in terms of the number of workpieces forming each such batch. The Interview Summary reflects agreement that none of the prior art teaches this novel and unobvious method.

Accordingly, early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #622/43633C3).

Respectfully submitted,

November 29, 2004



James F. McKeown
Registration No. 25,406
Vincent J. Sunderdick
Registration No. 29,004

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JFM:lrb/kms
348623